I doubt seriously that this will be a world-shaking event. I do feel that neither I nor anyone else will be placed in jeopardy for making this trip. And I should certainly hope that the State of Alabama will profit as much as my own State from my trip to Alabama.

Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat that I am going at my own expense. As has been indicated I voluntarily designated myself to go to this State. There has been no impression given that this is an official committee of this House or that we are speaking for any other Member of this House. We are going merely as observers. I hope that my colleagues from Alabama will join us on this mission, will meet with us and join with us in a spirit of cooperation, as that has been expressed, so that we may bring back something more constructive.

As I have said, this is a simple trip of an American citizen to an American State of this Union and as such it seems to me it should be supported by all of us and not condemned by any of us.

THE FARM MESSAGE

(Mr. POAGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, the President's message should set at rest the very proper concern which has disturbed so many of our people since the Director of the Budget wrote his much quoted article which many people interpreted to indicate a desire to force some 2½ million farm families out of their homes.

The President is a practical man and he has repudiated any such proposal.

He realizes that even though some of those now living on the farm will not be able to make a reasonable livelihood farming that it is much better for these people to stay where they are than it is to move them into the big cities.

The President's message clearly outlines the problems of our rural people and suggests a continuation of our present voluntary price support and production adjustment programs. I think this is a wise and a sound approach. As a Member of Congress I shall try to help the President keep these programs in operation.

I would emphasize, as did the President, that every impartial study has shown that the removal of price and income supports would have a catastrophic effect on farm income and farm income is too vital to our entire economy to be dealt with lightly. I am happy that the President has again indicated his deep concern for the welfare of those who provide the food and fiber for America.

THE SITUATION IN SELMA, ALA.

(Mr. MOORE asked and was given permission to address the House for 3 minutes and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I have a strong belief that the situation and the circumstances in Selma, Ala., are of such importance as to merit consideration by the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress. The appropriate authority in this House for such an inquiry into these facts and circumstances I believe is the Committee on Judiciary of the House of Representatives. I have therefore today requested the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER of New York, chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, to select from the membership of that committee a number of its members to visit Selma, Ala., for the express purpose of determining for themselves what the actual facts are. This committee of the House has direct jurisdiction over the legislative matters involved herein. I believe we should immediately determine the actual facts as they are found to exist in Selma, Ala.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary will act promptly and accede to my request that members of that committee be dispatched in a quasi-official mission to Selma, Ala., so that this House may have before it a complete recital of the facts and circumstances as they actually exist.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like again to point out, as I did earlier today, that responsible citizens of Selma have asked that a duly appointed and impartial congressional group come down and ascertain the correct facts. Day before yesterday both the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GEORGE ANDREWS] and I talked with Chairman EMANUEL CELLER of the House Judiciary Committee and made that request. We also appeared yesterday before the Senate Judiciary Committee with the same request. We felt that any investigative group that goes to Alabama should be composed of members of the Judiciary Committee of both the House and the Senate. Although no action has been taken as yet on our request, I am introducing today a joint resolution the purpose of which is to set up a joint committee in the event either Judiciary Committee chairman feels he presently does not have the authority to make these appointments.

Mr. Speaker, while I question the advisability, I certainly do not question the right of any Member of this body or any citizen of the United States to visit Selma. It should be made perfectly clear, however, that any self-appointed group from the Congress that goes to Selma does not in any way represent an investigative committee of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. MOORE. I took note of the meetings that were announced by the gentleman from Alabama and one of his colleagues. I believe as a supporter of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 it is entirely appropriate for me as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary to request that that committee which has the legislative jurisdiction in this area should move to obtain the facts and circumstances that exist there. I have, therefore, asked Chairman CELLER as a member of the committee, to follow through and designate Members to officially go down and take a look at the situation.

Mr. SELDEN. I want to say to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] that I welcome his support.

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. OTTINGER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GONZALEZ' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. OTTINGER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GONZALEZ' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION CONDEMNING THE SOVIET UNION FOR PERSECUTION OF THE JEWS

(Mr. ROOSEVELT (at the request of Mr. OTTINGER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a House concurrent resolution condemning the Soviet Union for persecution of the Jews.

I have asked representatives from both political parties and from all sections of the country to join me in condemning Russia for singling out Jews for extreme punishment for alleged economic offenses, confiscating synagogues, closing Jewish cemeteries, arresting rabbis, and lay religious leaders, and curtailing religious observances.

My resolution also protests the Russian practice of discriminating against Jews in cultural activities and access to higher education, imposing restrictions that prevent the reuniting of Jews with their families in other lands, and through other acts oppressing Jews in the free exercise of their faith.

An identical resolution has been offered in the Senate by Senator ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF, of Connecticut, and 67 cosponsors. I have asked House Members to introduce resolutions identical to mine so that the House and Senate resolutions would be uniform and so that by a showing of significant support the Foreign Affairs Committee will be encouraged to take early action.

I am delighted to announce, Mr. Speaker, that I have been joined by many Members of this body, who have indicated to me that they share my concern and views. I wish to thank each of my colleagues for their supporting resolutions. Further, I call to the attention of the House that these resolutions have been introduced simultaneously, indicating a unanimity of concern.

PERSECUTION OF JEWS IN THE SOVIET UNION

(Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. OTTINGER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to join more than 80 of our colleagues in sponsoring a concurrent resolution condemning Soviet anti-

the President or his advisers that it will change.

In fact on the very day the Senate Appropriation Subcommittee eased the ban on foods to Cairo, Nasser's Egyptian Government agreed to represent Communist China in Burundi, after that government closed the Peiping Embassy and invited its officials to leave because of subversive activities.

This "sign of our times" shows the link that Communist China has established with Nasser in Africa and how closely they are working together.

If administration officials would only look at their intelligence reports, they would learn that Nasser is delivering to the Congolese rebels some of the latest model Soviet-made weapons—including some that are even better than those in the U.S. Army's table of organization.

One such weapon, I understand, is a recoilless repeating bazooka, which startled intelligence experts of both the military and the Central Intelligence Agency.

Mr. Speaker, certainly we do not want to be a partner with Nasser and the Soviet Union in putting these arms in the hands of the Congolese rebels who are bent on destroying all of our missionaries of whatever faith, in the Congo.

It is Nasser who is denying food to his own people by helping the Soviet Union wage their "wars of destruction" throughout Africa.

Mr. Speaker, on February 1, 1965, Acting Secretary of State George W. Ball, testified before the Senate Appropriations Committee as follows:

> We ask, therefore, that the Congress not limit the President's freedom of action in the conduct of our relations with this key country during the weeks ahead.

Mr. Speaker, title VII, United States Code, section 1721 states:

> In order to enable the President to furnish emergency assistance on behalf of the peoples of the United States to friendly peoples in meeting famine or other urgent or extraordinary relief requirements, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall make available to the President out of its stocks such surplus agricultural commodities (as defined in section 1706 of this title) as he may request, for transfer (1) to any nation friendly to the United States in order to meet famine or other urgent or extraordinary relief requirements of such nation, and (2) to friendly but needy populations without regard to the friendliness of their government.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I have been advised by the American Law Division of the Library of Congress, that under the law, the President may use his contingency fund if he feels the good faith and honor of this country has been affected by House action on House Joint Resolution 234.

In summary, then, Mr. Speaker, I should like to remind Members of the House that my amendment was limited to title I sales under Public Law 480. It does not affect title II, III, and IV, and under these titles the President, in my opinion, still has plenty of room to maneuver if he sees fit, for under title II the President has the authority to donate surplus agricultural commodities to nations to meet emergencies; under title III, the President has the authority to assist international welfare agencies, international feeding programs, and to participate in barter transactions; under title IV, the President has the authority to sell surplus agricultural commodities to nations for dollars.

Now, to those who would argue that the Congress has no right to act as we did in this area, I would remind them that Public Law 480 was a creation of the Congress, and so we have every right to amend provisions, oversee, and evaluate its operation, or repeal it, for that matter.

I do hope the House will stick by its guns and stand by its original position, by voting in support of my motion to instruct the conferees when this matter comes up for consideration next Monday.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S STATEMENT ON AMENDMENT RELATING TO SALE OF SURPLUS COMMODITIES TO THE UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC UNDER TITLE I OF PUBLIC LAW 480

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to insert a statement of President Johnson at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's statement at his press conference on the amendment relating to sales of surplus commodities to the United Arab Republic under title I of Public Law 480 is as follows:

> Last week the House adopted a proposal that would, if enacted, preclude the United States from carrying out our present 3-year agreement, ending this June, to sell surplus commodities to the United Arab Republic under title I of Public Law 480. Yesterday, the Senate passed a modified version of this proposal, which would permit the completion of details of the agreement if I, as the President, determine this to be in our national interest.
>
> It is of the greatest importance that the flexibility provided to me by the Senate action be sustained by the Congress. Our relations with the United Arab Republic present difficult problems in a highly sensitive area of the world; the area where tensions are high. The basic purpose of our policy in this area has been, and will continue to be, the protection of our vital interests. To do this it is essential that I have freedom of action.
>
> It is obvious that an improvement in relations between our two countries will require efforts on both sides. It is impossible to predict whether such an improvement would be achieved. But if there is to be any chance of success at all, it can only be if I have adequate flexibility to deal with this complex and volatile situation.

RACIAL TROUBLE IN SELMA, ALA.

(Mr. HAWKINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, it is not my intent to answer anything that has been said to those of us who have voluntarily taken upon ourselves the opportunity to travel and assist a State of this Union. I have personally been invited by the Southern Christian Leadership Conference and by Dr. King and by citizens of Selma to observe what is going on in that State. It is not my intent to test any law, and it is not my intent even to stay in one of the hotels of that State. It is my intent to stay in a Negro home when I go to Selma, Ala., and to return to Washington with great dispatch. I do not consider my trip to Alabama or to any other State of the Union as being for the purpose of agitating or engaging in any type of activity which would prompt anyone to be placed in danger. It is my intent to go as an observer. I certainly will avail myself of the opportunity to seek information on both sides. I would hope that the public officials of that State would meet with us and try to work out with us some understanding of what is happening in that State. A few days ago I saw a picture in the newspaper. I do not know whether it is authentic or not, but this was a picture of a woman, and it happened to be a Negro woman, who was lying on the ground. Three sheriffs were on top of her and a police stick was upraised and used on this woman while she was on the ground. This does not, to me, as an American citizen, portray the image of a good State nor, certainly, of law-abiding individuals engaged in the proper enforcement of the law. If this happened in my city, I quite assure you that there would certainly be a great uproar. I am not judging this and I am not saying that this woman was right or wrong and I am not saying that the law officials were right or wrong. However, it certainly indicates to me that there may be something wrong, for which reason other Americans at least should attempt to observe the situation so that they will have some knowledge of what is going on there. As I have indicated, others will be going with me. I am certainly not the chairman of this group. I did not organize it. I am simply one who has seen fit to join it. I certainly hope that the expressions that have been made today on both sides will be helpful in bringing about some type of understanding of what has happened in our American society.

To me brotherhood is not so wild a dream as it is to those who propose postponing it pretend. Personally I believe we can bring about brotherhood even in the Southern States. I was born in a southern State myself before my family migrated to Los Angeles. So I think I can speak as a southerner. I think I know something of the feelings of southerners. I know of the great emotions that have been aroused as a result of some of these happenings. I know that this Congress has passed three laws to secure the voting rights of the citizens of every State of this Union. I do know and feel that some of these laws are not being upheld. Whether the law should be strengthened is something which is certainly worthy of some attention. If I shall have observed something in Alabama that might make me a better Congressman or put me in a better position to recommend something to strengthen brotherhood in our country then I think certainly a great mission will have been accomplished.

Semitism and the singling out of Soviet citizens of the Jewish faith for extreme punishment for alleged economic crimes.

On January 4, 1965, I introduced House Resolution 50 expressing the same sentiments on the part of the House alone. The concurrent resolution in the other body to the one the House receives today states the unanimity of opinion on this matter on the part of the resolution's adherents in both the Houses of the Congress.

As I stated last year, when I introduced an identical House resolution, it is clear that the Soviet Government and the Communist Party have fostered and encouraged religious persecution in the Soviet Union. In the case of its Jewish citizens, the Soviet Government has singled them out in reporting arrests and executions for alleged economic crimes; it has confiscated synagogues, closed Jewish cemeteries, arrested Rabbis, curtailed religious observances and Jewish cultural activities.

It is my hope, and I know the hope of those others of our colleagues joining in the sponsorship of this resolution today, that the Soviet Government, in the name of decency and humanity, will cease its persecution of Soviet Jews and permit the free exercise of religion by all of its citizens.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART II

(Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. OTTINGER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues part II of the New York Herald Tribune series on New York City in Crisis.

The following installment concerns the tragic failure of urban renewal in New York City and appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on January 26, 1965:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—URBAN RENEWAL HOPE: PLAGUED BY INDECISION—AROUSED AND INDIGNANT

("We're fighting all over the world to preserve democracy and then we find ourselves kicked in the teeth in our own city," said one caller to the Herald Tribune. He was among scores of citizens responding yesterday to the first article of "New York City in Crisis," and among millions of New Yorkers who feel that the greatest city in the world may no longer be the greatest place in which to live. The Herald Tribune is presenting this special investigative series on the deeply disturbing characteristics of a city in crisis with the aim of ending the bewilderment, frustration, rage, fear, and indifference that have become hallmarks of city life. It welcomes any public reaction and hopes that out of these articles can come some positive direction to reopen the channels of civic creativity: Whether in terms of individual response, a banding together of citizens, or a change in the pattern of municipal responsibility.)

(By Barry Gottehrer and Marshall Peck)

To New York and dozens of other cities, fighting a seemingly endless, sometimes futile war against spreading slums, urban renewal has become the chief—and essential—weapon for progress. But in New York—and elsewhere to varying degrees—it is frequently a peculiar sort of progress, one that destroys slums out of necessity but one that also often destroys small businesses and uproots lower income families out of ignorance, incompetence and indecision.

Despite the city's extravagant claims, the 15-year-old slum-clearance program in New York has consistently failed to live up to its original purpose—"the realization as soon as feasible of a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family."

The slum-clearance program officially came into being in 1949 with the passage of the title I section of the Federal Housing Act. Under the legislation, the Federal Government agreed to pay cities for slum clearance and redeveloping by putting up two-thirds (the other third to be paid in full by the city or split between the city and the State) of the cost of buying up and clearing slum areas. The cleared land was then to be turned over to builders and developers at a considerably lower price than they would have had to pay if they had cleared the land themselves.

WHEN IT BEGAN

The term "urban renewal" was brought into use in 1954 when the Federal Housing Act was extended to provide Federal assistance on a similar basis for conservation, rehabilitation and comprehensive planning and redevelopment.

Since 1949, the U.S. Government has approved more than $4 billion worth of urban renewal contributions nationally, with more than $263 million allocated for New York City. Out of this, after 15 years, the city now has 41 federally aided projects totaling 53,074 apartment units in varying stages of planning or construction.

Through last month, however, only 3 of these 41 projects and only 24,052 of these 53,074 apartments were listed as completed by the housing and redevelopment board. In a city in which the slums and ghettos continue to spread and where there is a desperate need for more public and middle-income housing, 15 years of urban-renewal work and money have not made notably impressive headway.

The failure of the city's urban renewal program—coupled with a severe shortage of public housing (New York voters rejected 2 amendments last November that would have provided 2,500 additional public-housing units)—has made the housing problem one of the most critical facing the city.

Some 1.2o million New Yorkers live in substandard housing today and more than 300,000 need to and can't get into public housing.

The white, middle class continues to desert the city (more than 800,000 have left since 1950) because the apartments in Manhattan are, for the most part, too small or too expensive.

And the city's Negro and Puerto Ricans, the principal victims of urban renewal, continue to be pushed from one slum to another.

One of the most outspoken and articulate critics of haphazardly administered and poorly planned urban renewal is Representative JOHN V. LINDSAY, whose 17th Congressional District includes the Bellevue South area. To the Republican Congressman, urban renewal is necessary for progress. But he seems to feel that in New York City urban renewal has unfortunately been allowed to become a necessary evil instead of a necessary good in many instances.

"The purpose of the Housing Act of 1949 is not served when we indiscriminately erase whole communities from the map," says Mr. LINDSAY. "We must stop destroying neighborhoods in the name of urban renewal. We must stop ruining businesses, scattering the families we should keep and creating greater pressure on deteriorating housing—all in the name of urban renewal. Past programs have been urban removal rather than urban renewal."

PAYING THE PRICE

To a great extent, New York City today is paying for the capricious manner in which the urban renewal program was run through the years. Under the direction of master builder Robert Moses and his committee on slum clearance, the urban renewal or title I program—as it was originally called—was the subject of criticism and the object of controversy almost from the beginning.

Unlike other cities, which would relocate the residents and then clear the land before turning the sites over to private developers, New York insisted upon turning over the sites with the buildings still standing and the tenants still paying rent. This was done because Mr. Moses said it was the only way he could get firm commitments from developers. And what Mr. Moses wanted, Mr. Moses got.

It was precisely this policy, which allowed developers to delay relocation and clearance almost indefinitely while collecting rents from their slum tenants, that led to the start of the program's troubles. By mid-1956, with 10 projects approved but all running far behind schedule, hints of scandal and criticism of the way many slum residents were being treated were commonplace. But the biggest explosion—centering around the Manhattantown project, a six-block area between Amsterdam Avenue and Central Park West and 97th and 100th Streets—was yet to come.

The plan, calling for the construction of 17 apartment houses with 2,720 units, was approved by the board of estimate in September of 1951 and scheduled for completion by August of 1956. Manhattantown, Inc.—a group of developers headed by a builder named Jack Ferman and Samuel Caspert, who previously had been appointed a city marshal by Mayor William O'Dwyer—obtained the six-block area, which the city had condemned for $16.3 million, for $3.1 million, putting up only $1 million in cash.

THE MANHATTANTOWN STORY

But it wasn't until the fall of 1954 when the U.S. Senate Banking and Currency Committee held a 1-day hearing in New York that the story began to leak out.

Mr. Caspert disclosed how he had set up a separate firm headed by his son-in-law which bought all the refrigerators and gas ranges in the Manhattantown tenements for $33,000.

The son-in-law then rented the exact same refrigerators and ranges back to Manhattantown which, in less than a year, paid him $115,326. Though the Senate committee reported that $649,215 had been siphoned out of the Manhattantown project by similar methods in its first 18 months of operation, no official action was taken by either Mayor Wagner or Mr. Moses.

When charges of irregularities continued and the project's scheduled completion day came in August of 1956 without a single building having even been started, Mr. Moses blamed the Federal officials for taking too much time in underwriting a loan for the developers. Yet even when the loans were approved the Manhattantown developers did not pick them up. The situation became so bad in the Manhattantown tenements that one tenant complained she had no hot water for 3 months and no water at all for 1 month.

By mid-1957, the dimensions of the problem no longer could be evaded or denied. Though developers were collecting millions of dollars in rent from slum tenements throughout the city, some of them had not even bothered to pay their taxes or interest to the city. Of the $1 million owed the city, Manhattantown owed more than $414,000.

THE MAYOR'S VIEW

Finally, on June 11, 1957, the slum clearance committee recommended that the city start foreclosure action to repossess the Manhattantown site. Nearly 6 years after the project had first been approved, Manhattantown had not paid its taxes (which now totaled $620,000), had not cleared its land, had not started construction of its first apartment, and had not even picked up its Federal commitments.

At a city hall press conference, Mayor Wagner, who had steadfastly supported the slum clearance committee and its chairman and would continue to do so, was asked why he had done nothing but deny all charges involving Manhattantown in the past.

"We were misled," said the mayor.

"You mean to say you were conned for 5 years?" asked one reporter, who had been a persistent critics of the Manhattantown setup.

"Well, if you want to put it that way—yes," he said. "I guess you could say we were conned for 5 years."

Ultimately, under a new sponsor (Webb and Knapp, later relaced by Alcoa Residences, Inc.) and under a new name (Park West Village), the Manhattantown project became a reality. Today, 2,525 units are occupied (at rents between $28 and $55 a room) and another 140 are underway.

Manhattantown, however, wasn't the only urban renewal project tainted with scandal and dotted with irregularities. In others, it also became obvious that urban renewal might not always work for the benefit of the slum residents, but it certainly didn't harm the developers.

At one point, the program was being run so haphazardly that a Federal Housing Administrator in Washington reportedly decided to do something about it. According to the story, the Administrator sent word to the slum clearance committee in New York that further funds would be withheld until the city cleaned up its program, eliminated the scandal, and started providing better housing and relocation for the people pushed out.

Within a week, the Administrator reportedly received a call from a superior. The message was supposed to have been loud and clear: "Leave Bob Moses and New York alone."

The administrator is said to have taken the advice and Mr. Moses, whose own honesty and integrity have never been questioned, continued to administer New York's urban renewal program in the way he saw fit.

(The Tribune repeatedly has attempted to interview Mr. Moses about his role in the city's urban renewal program and its history, but has been told that Mr. Moses would under no condition speak to anyone from this newspaper about anything.)

Finally in 1960, the Housing and Redevelopment Board was established to take over the duties of the slum clearance committee and six other municipal programs. Unfortunately in New York, unlike several other cities (Boston, for one), the urban renewal program and the city's planning unit, both of which overlap in many areas, were not brought under a single administration.

A PLANNING DECISION

It is still up to the city planning commission, which has received $3.7 million from the Federal Government under a new urban renewal arm called the community renewal program, to hold preliminary hearings and designate specific areas for urban renewal.

It is then up to the HRB to request additional funds from the Federal government for further study of these designated areas and, perhaps someday, for ultimate condemnation and clearance. Theoretically the HRB cannot initiate an urban renewal project and the planning commission cannot complete one.

Caught up in this massive bureaucracy and this needless duplication of time, money, and effort, hundreds of thousands of New Yorkers must wait—unable to move because there is no place to move to and unable to repair their homes or businesses because banks are extremely reluctant to extend credit to someone whose business or home might be torn down in the next few years.

What then is the difference between the city's urban renewal program 5 years ago and today? Essentially, the difference seems to be that the people running the program now have their hearts in the right place. There are still occasional whispers of scandal, but they are infrequent and unsubstantiated.

Under Chairman Milton Mollen, who last week was named to coordinate all of the city's housing programs, the HRB picked up the cry of other cities in following the leadership of New Haven Mayor Richard Lee and his emphasis on human renewal. Mr. Mollen tactfully avoids criticizing the old Slum Clearance Committee ("I'd rather not talk about the past," he says), but believes that the entire emphasis of the program has changed for the better—"from simply clearing slums to a concern for the problems they symptomize."

"I think urban renewal is the hope of many areas of the city," he says. "Without it, there's uncertainty. As it is, there's inaction on one hand. In certain areas, such as Bedford-Stuyvesant, private enterprise won't go in. On the other hand, in other areas, private real estate interests are moving in. They only disrupt the neighborhood and they provide no relocation for the people."

If New York now, the department of relocation, which was set up in November of 1962, has taken the job of urban-renewal relocating away from the builders. And the city itself—and not the builders—remains in control of the apartments and stores, collecting the rents until everyone is relocated and the site is cleared. Then—and only then—is the land turned over to the developers.

These are decided improvements—steps in the right direction—but the administration of the program and its accomplishments remain far from impressive.

One need look no further than Lincoln Center for a vivid example of the city's urban renewal program at its very best and yet at the same time, still not satisfying everyone.

At its best, the Lincoln Center project cleared away a seriously blighted area and provided the city with a cultural core—including a new theater, a new philharmonic hall, and an opera house—that any city in the world would be proud to possess.

Yet even here—where the beauty and worth of the cultural center so clearly demonstate a step forward from the slum it replaced—there has been criticism—and, to a degree, the criticism is valid.

CAUSE FOR CRITICISM

In the place of the low rent, admittedly slum housing, a string of expensive apartment house has been built—far out of the price range of the people these buildings have dispossessed. This is the continuing failure of urban renewal—this aimless traffic and removal of lower income people from one slum to another—and it is one that New York officials have been unable to solve.

HRB officials are quick to point out that the Lincoln Center apartment houses are integrated, but they usually fail to mention that they are integrated by upper middle class Negroes and not by Negroes and Puerto Ricans who had been driven from the area by the bulldozers. These houses, where 90 percent of the 4,271 apartments rent for $61 a room, have at best token integration and the project, despite HRB denials, is a prime example of what civil rights leaders call "Negro removal."

"It's unfortunate that someone has to be hurt and suffer but you have got to think of the greater need and the greater good," says one city official. "And, for a city the size of New York, the greater need is the elimination of slums."

Few people—even those uprooted by urban renewal—would dispute this. Everybody knows slums are bad and everybody knows slums must go. But what troubles these people and the many, many others is the lack of leadership from city hall, the indecision and the bureaucracy of the planning and urban renewal units, the corruption, the politics, the inhumanity, and the irrationality that have plagued this city's clearance program throughout the years of its existence.

DESPERATION OR DECISION?

It makes little sense to clear one slum merely to start another one somewhere else. New housing is desperately needed, but, unfortunately, those who are the most desperate have, for the most part, been the last to get it.

Anyone can tell you that Harlem and Bedford-Stuyvesant both need immediate and far-sweeping urban renewal programs and low and lower middle income housing, but, because of the magnitude of the problem and the uncertainty of where to house the people while the areas are being rebuilt, the city chooses to look and rebuild elsewhere.

"I'm absolutely committed to making New York a slumless city, a city in which every family, regardless of race, color, or creed, will live in a decent home, at a price it can afford to pay, in a good neighborhood with soundly planned community facilities," wrote Mayor Wagner in a series of syndicated articles last summer.

The mayor obviously meant every word he wrote, but, to those people forced to move out of Bellevue South, Lincoln Center, and dozens of other renewal areas and those people unable to move out of Harlem, Bedford-Stuyvesant and the city's other slums, the mayor's inaction speaks louder than his words. No matter what name you call it—be it human renewal or human removal—the city's housing problems are extreme and in desperate need of remedial action.

(Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. OTTINGER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. MULTER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

ANNOUNCEMENT TO MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CONCERNING REPRINTING OF STATEMENTS MADE ON THE 47TH ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINE'S INDEPENDENCE

(Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. OTTINGER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce that reprints will be made of statements of Members of the House of Representatives on the occasion of the 47th anniversary of the independence of Ukraine. The reprinting has been requested by the Ukrainian

union dues paid under such circumstances will not be used for purposes foreign to a union's function as collective-bargaining agent.

Those who advocate compulsory unionism and oppose State right-to-work laws frequently advance the "free rider" argument. Within limits, this argument has merit; it goes like this: Under the law, when a union is selected by the majority of employees in a bargaining unit, that union is required by law to represent, not just those employees who voluntarily join the union, but all employees in the unit. Since the union must represent all employees, and since all employees theoretically benefit from the union's services as bargaining agent, it is only fair that all employees should be required to pay dues. Employees who do not pay dues are referred to as "free riders."

This argument has considerable appeal in the case of a union which uses its dues only for those purposes for which it is required by statute to represent all of the employees. However, it is very important to note that section 9(a) of the National Labor Relations Act provides that a labor organization selected by a majority of employees "shall be the exclusive representative of all the employees in such unit for the purposes of collective bargaining in respect to rates of pay, wages, hours of employment, or other conditions of employment."

Obviously, the "free rider" argument rings hollow when it is sounded by spokesmen who vigorously oppose any effective legislation to prevent the use of union dues for political or other purposes not related to a union's statutory function as bargaining agent.

As for me, I agree with Mr. Justice Douglas, of the U.S. Supreme Court, when he stated:

> The collection of dues for paying the costs of collective bargaining of which a member is a beneficiary is one thing. If, however, dues are used, or assessments are made, to promote or oppose birth control, to repeal or increase the taxes on cosmetics, to promote or oppose the admission of Red China into the United Nations, and the like, then the group compels an individual to support with his money causes beyond what gave rise to the need for group action.

And Mr. Justice Douglas went on to say:

> I think the same must be said when union dues or assessments are used to elect a Governor, a Congressman, a Senator, or a President. It may be said that the election of a Franklin D. Roosevelt rather than a Calvin Coolidge might be the best possible way to serve the cause of collective bargaining. But even such a selective use of union funds for political purposes subordinates the individual's first amendment rights to the views of the majority. I do not see how that can be done, even though the objector retains his rights to campaign, to speak, to vote as he chooses. For when union funds are used for that purpose, the individual is required to finance political projects against which he may be in rebellion. (*International Machinists* v. *Street*, 376 U.S. 740.)

It is worthy of note that other forced associations are not altogether uncommon or alien to our American way of life. For example, in many States an attorney is compelled to join and pay dues to a bar association in order to practice his profession.

However, I am confident that few Members of Congress—and surely no liberals—would oppose a proposition to preclude the bar association, where membership is compulsory from, first, discriminating against Negroes or, second, using its dues for purposes not related to its professional function or, third, penalizing members for exercising constitutional or other legal rights.

Finally, the safeguards in my bill reflect a serious concern about the ability of a union member to exercise the constitutional and legal rights available to other American citizens.

Unfortunately, there seems to be a noticeable trend on the part of the NLRB and some courts to downgrade and subordinate the legal and constitutional rights of individuals when they become union members subject to union discipline. It is disturbing when any union member is relegated to the status of a second-class citizen. However, this is an alarming and intolerable situation as it affects those who are compelled to be union members in order to work.

Union members have been penalized by union officials for speaking out on political issues in opposition to union policy.

Union members have been fined for not engaging in concerted activities of a union even though section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act specifically confers upon every employee "the right to refrain from any and all such activities."

According to the strange rationale recently applied by the NLRB, such rights are protected when exercised by an employee—but not when exercised by an employee who is a union member.

Under recent Board decisions, a union member who is fined for violating union policy is not necessarily left with an option to pay the fine or drop out of the union. He can be compelled to pay the fine, even if it means garnishment of his wages or attachment of his property.

Surely, if compulsory unionism is to be sanctioned by the Federal Government throughout the 50 States, the right of dissent without reprisal must be guaranteed. The words of Justice Douglas speak eloquently to this point:

> If an association is compelled, the individual should not be forced to surrender any matters of conscience, belief, or expression. He should be allowed to enter the group with his own flag flying, whether it be religious, political, or philosophical; nothing that the group does should deprive him of the privilege of preserving and expressing his agreement, disagreement, or dissent, whether it coincides with the view of the group, or conflicts with it in minor or major ways, and he should not be required to finance the promotion of causes with which he disagrees.

I believe my bill is fair and reasonable. It recognizes merit in the arguments for union security, but it does not sacrifice basic individual rights which are at least of equal importance.

It may be that extreme partisans in the ranks of management and labor will not applaud this bill. However, I am confident that the vast majority of thoughtful Americans in and out of Congress will not abandon or ignore the sound principles which it represents.

THE CIVIL RIGHTS SITUATION IN ALABAMA

(Mr. SELDEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, the potentially explosive situation in Selma and other communities in my home State of Alabama is a cause for growing national concern.

There are many conflicting reports regarding the true state of affairs in these Alabama communities, but of this much we are certain: further exacerbation of existing tensions in these areas might well result in a complete breakdown of law and order and consequent violence and bloodshed.

As an Alabamian, I am, of course, deeply concerned with the welfare of my State and its citizens. As a Member of Congress, I believe some measure of responsibility to avert such a tragedy devolves upon the Congress in this case.

Those who last year supported the Civil Rights Act of 1964 did so in the belief—as one advocate of that legislation phrased it—that passage of the bill would "elevate the civil rights movement from the streets to the court."

Unfortunately and irresponsibly, leaders of the civil rights movement have otherwise interpreted the meaning of enactment of the civil rights bill. In Selma, in Marion, and in other communities of Alabama, these irresponsible leaders have, in effect, taken their movement from the courts into the streets, defying normal processes of justice, law, and order.

What are the true facts regarding the events now transpiring in Alabama? The people of the United States want to know and are entitled to know. And the people of Alabama not only willingly, but eagerly, await an honest, impartial investigation of these events.

In this regard, on Tuesday I received a telegram from Mr. Roswell Falkenberry, publisher of the Selma Times-Journal, a leading citizen of that community. Mr. Falkenberry said:

SELMA, ALA.

HON. ARMISTEAD SELDEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

In view of continued provocation of local Negro citizens by professional agitators, despite conscientious efforts of a responsible white community to comply with the Civil Rights Act of 1964, this newspaper respectfully requests that you urge the immediate appointment of a joint congressional commission to investigate the actual conditions existing in Selma at this time. We urge that an unbiased, responsible group representing both the House and the Senate be dispatched to this city immediately as factfinders to observe the situation in which the city of Selma is being thwarted in an attempt to observe all existing local, State, and Federal statutes.

We believe that the Congress should determine for themselves the true facts without regard to race traditions or propaganda. You must agree that firsthand, on-the-scene knowledge of tragic conditions in any community is equally as important to the national welfare as any of the various surveys which have been conducted by the Congress

Jerry Graham and Rudy Ruderman have performed a most constructive public service in producing the program "The Film You Can Not See." I urge all my colleagues to act favorably on the petition which WNEW radio has laid before the Congress.

CONDEMNING SOVIET PERSECUTION

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, today I join with several of my colleagues in the House and Senate in again introducing a resolution condemning Soviet persecution of her citizens of the Jewish faith. It is known that religion is not looked upon favorably by the Soviet Union. It is also known that those of the Jewish religion have a particularly difficult time in practicing their religion. The power of the Soviet state consistently has been used to prevent the free exercise of the Jewish religion; synagogues and seminaries have been closed; religious publications suppressed; the baking and distribution of matzohs during Passover prevented; numerous "economic crimes" have been charged against Jews; and various other state-encouraged deprivations have occurred. I do not have to go into greater detail concerning this religious persecution, as the facts have become well known.

On December 19, 1963, in a speech on the floor of the House I delivered a detailed account of the situation in the Soviet Union. At that time I submitted facts which showed that restrictions on Jewish worship were far greater than on other minority religions.

If the experience of the last 30 years teaches anything, it teaches that we cannot be silent in the face of anti-Semitism. As the Representatives of the people, we have a special obligation to express the conscience of America on this important issue. The resolution I have introduced today states:

That it is the sense of the House that persecution of any persons because of their religion by the Soviet Union be condemned, and that the Soviet Union in the name of decency and humanity cease executing persons for alleged economic offenses, and fully permit the free exercise of religion and the pursuit of culture by Jews and all others within its borders.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution. Let us pass it before Passover, which falls on April 16 of this year. On February 3, the Rabbinical Council of America representing 900 rabbis in the United States and Canada appealed to the new Soviet leaders to permit the baking of matzohs. If this resolution is adopted by April 16, it would aid in this appeal and further the cause of religious freedom.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I congratulate the gentleman on his statement and the resolution he has introduced. I introduced earlier this week a similar resolution which I had also introduced in the 88th Congress, but which was not acted upon. I join with the gentleman urging support of these resolutions.

Mr. RYAN. I thank the gentleman for his support in this great cause.

EMPLOYEE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

(Mr. GRIFFIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, none of the legislative issues confronting the 89th Congress is likely to stir more controversy or generate more heat than the proposal to repeal section 14(b)—that provision of the Taft-Hartley Act which leaves with the several States the authority to outlaw compulsory union shop agreements.

What promises to be a debate of major proportions is already raging in and out of Congress, ignited by President Johnson's reference to 14(b) in his recent state of the Union address. As this debate proceeds toward an historic climax, it is my purpose today to focus attention upon certain fundamental legal and civil rights which are inextricably involved in any thoughtful consideration of legislation to sanction compulsory unionism—legal and civil rights which, in this context, the modern-day "pseudoliberal" seems eager to ignore or brush aside.

It is my firm conviction that repeal of 14(b) must be conditioned upon the enactment of certain fundamental safeguards for the workers who are, or would be, compelled to join and make payments to a union in order to hold their jobs. If such safeguards are included, along with meaningful provision for effective enforcement, I am prepared to support, and to advocate, the repeal of section 14(b).

I have today introduced a bill, H.R. 4350, which would accomplish these purposes. It is entitled the "Employee Civil Rights Act of 1965."

It is a bill which ought to rally the enthusiastic support of true liberals in both parties.

My bill would strike the existing provisions of 14(b), and would extend the privilege of negotiating union shop agreements to labor organizations in all of the 50 States. However, my bill would not take away State power to check union abuses in this area without substituting Federal power to protect the basic legal and civil rights of individual workers who would be affected.

Briefly, under my bill it would be unlawful for a union which makes an agreement requiring membership as a condition of employment—

First, to discriminate on account of race, color or creed;

Second, to use the dues collected for political purposes or for any other purpose not related to the union's statutory function as collective bargaining agent; or

Third, to fine or penalize a member for exercising any legal or civil right guaranteed by the Constitution or laws of the United States.

Of course, the enumeration of such basic individual rights would be meaningless without provision for effective enforcement. Under my bill, a union which violates any of these fundamental employee rights could not enforce a contract provision which imposes union membership as a condition of employment. Those who suffer damages as the result of a violation could file a civil suit in Federal district court, or they could file an unfair labor practice charge with the National Labor Relations Board, in order to obtain appropriate relief.

As my bill indicates, I join the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor in the call for an end to discrimination in union membership and union apprenticeship programs. And, I share his recently expressed concern that 14(b) should not be repealed unless "assurances" are provided that unions which enforce compulsory membership requirements will not discriminate.

Of course, I assume that the chairman is also contemplating "assurances" in the nature of accompanying legislative safeguards with effective enforcement provisions. Surely, responsible legislators could accept nothing less.

While impressive strides have been made toward political equality in recent years, this progress has not been altogether comforting for the American who cannot get a job because of his color. To be sure, the "Equal Employment Opportunity" title of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, despite its limitations, can be a useful instrument in the eventual attainment of its stated goal. However, the way provided by title VII of the Civil Rights Act, which requires discrimination charges to be filed first with a State agency, must look like a long and almost hopeless road to Negroes in a number of States.

It is unfortunate, but true, that discrimination by labor unions is often a more serious problem for the Negro than discrimination by employers. This is particularly true so far as apprenticeship and training programs are concerned. Where compulsory union membership is not a requirement, Negroes can often find it easier to obtain a job, or an opportunity for training.

Obviously, if Congress, without providing effective safeguards, should repeal 14(b) and thereby sanction compulsory unionism in the 19 States which have so-called "right-to-work" laws, the Congress, by its action, would actually reduce the economic opportunities for Negroes and increase the difficulties they face.

Surely, a Congress that is truly concerned about poverty and the economic plight of the Negro, will not deliberately extend compulsory unionism into the very States, in some cases, where discrimination problems are the most serious—unless individual workers are effectively protected against discrimination.

My deep concern for another fundamental civil right is appropriately reflected in the safeguards of this bill. Individual citizens—including those compelled to join a union—are entitled to political freedom. Moreover, they are entitled to meaningful assurance that